



FRANK E. DAVIDSON, Member of Board of Directors and Editor of the Bulletin and five times President of the Illinois Society of Architects, Treasurer, and one of the organizers of the Architects Club of Chicago, Member of the Chicago Chapter, American Institute of Architects, Died April 14, 1931.

OFFICERS

Robert C. Ostergren.....	President
155 N. Clark Street. Tel. Central 4616	
Victor A. Matteson.....	Vice-President
20 N. Wacker Drive. Tel. Cent. 9147	
George B. Helmle.....	Second Vice-President
Springfield, Illinois	
Clarence E. Frazier.....	Treasurer
64 W. Randolph St. Tel. Rand. 2084	
Walter A. McDougall.....	Secretary
360 N. Michigan Ave. Tel. Rand. 3569	
H. L. Palmer.....	Financial Secretary
160 N. La Salle Street. Tel. Central 4214	

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

For One Year.....	Leon E. Stanhope	
For Two Years.....	E. S. Hall	Tirrell J. Ferrenz
For Three Years....	William P. Fox	Harry B. Wheelock

BOARD OF ARBITRATION

Frank A. Carpenter	Joseph C. Llewellyn
N. Max Dunning	George C. Nimmons
Elmer C. Jensen	Irving K. Pond
Richard E. Schmidt	

EDITORIAL STAFF MONTHLY BULLETIN

Leon E. Stanhope

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

E. S. Hall, Chairman Leon E. Stanhope

**ILLINOIS SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS MEETING
HELD APRIL 28, 1931**

Regular monthly meeting of the Illinois Society of Architects was held Tuesday evening, April 28, 1931, at the Architects Club.

Two announcements read by the secretary informing the Society of the death of Past President Frank E. Davidson on April 13, 1931, and the death of Mrs. Maud L. Stanhope, wife of Past President Leon E. Stanhope, on April 18, 1931. Mr. Pond read a very fine tribute to Mr. F. E. Davidson. The following resolution was read:

WHEREAS: There has been taken from our midst, our beloved friend and fellow architect, FRANK EUGENE DAVIDSON, member of our Board of Directors and five times President of our Society and the first editor of our Monthly Bulletin.

FRANK EUGENE DAVIDSON was one of our outstanding architects. His work in the erection of many of our industrial buildings, such as the Continental Can Company, Olson Rug Company, Holland Furnace Company and many other buildings will stand as a monument to his skill and ability.

WHEREAS: FRANK EUGENE DAVIDSON was always active in the betterment of the architectural profession and the development of the building industry,

RESOLVED: That we as an organization will always cherish his memory and that we regret his passing not alone as a worker in our ranks but as a beloved friend, and we in regular meeting assembled extend our deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

It was moved by Mr. Ferrenz, seconded and carried: That the foregoing resolution be adopted by the Society.

It was moved by Mr. I. K. Pond, regularly seconded and carried: That the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS: A great loss has come to our brother architect and member of our Board of Directors, Past President LEON EUGENE STANHOPE, in the passing of his beloved wife, we, the Illinois Society of Architects, in regular meeting assembled, extend our deepest sympathy to him in his hour of bereavement and that a copy of this resolution be sent to him.

Both of the foregoing resolutions were adopted by a rising vote by the entire assemblage.

Mr. Palmer announced the death of Mr. Edward A. Peterson, Rockford, Illinois.

Mr. Ferrenz was requested to report on the meeting of a group of state architectural societies held at San Antonio, Texas. Mr. Ferrenz stated that there were eighteen state architectural societies and that fourteen of these societies were represented at the convention. The principal idea of

the State Societies was to bring all architects together, so that the full weight of the architectural profession may be felt; it was not the purpose to form an additional society similar to the American Institute and this body went on record against a new national organization. However, they hope to promote a national organization in every state. The committee was appointed to weld all state organizations together. The main object of this organization this year was to have government work done by others than the government architect.

Mr. Ferrenz stated that the California organization has a membership of 746 members out of a total of 748 architects licensed to practice through the state and that since the organization has been formed, the architects of California are doing 34 per cent of all jobs, representing 60 per cent in dollar value throughout the state. This organization sells their news service from architects' offices, making a total of \$10,000 per year and with this money provides traveling scholarships and a full time investigator for violations of architectural practice.

Mr. Hall was requested to report on the organization of State Societies and National Council Architectural Registration Boards which met in San Antonio at the same time. On account of these two meetings being held at the same time, Mr. Hall was unable to attend many meetings of the State Societies regarding the N. C. A. R. Boards, but stated this was the 11th meeting of this association and it was the best meeting that it had ever held and that the association is getting much closer together. They are working for a uniform examination in all states.

"DAVIDSON DEAD?"

Such was the entire wording of a cable handed me as I came into my hotel on the night of April 14th. I had it in mind to write him on the morrow in answer to one of his always constructive and interesting letters about the Architects' Club which I had received a few days before the arrival of this fateful cable. Of course my first thought was one of personal grief because of the loss of a tried and valued friend but that thought was soon swallowed up by the realization of what his going meant to the Illinois Society of Architects and to the Architects' Club. It was Davidson who first, in 1919, aroused my interest in the Illinois Society which through him and through H. L. Palmer, more than through anybody else, had become the most important and influential State association of architects in the whole United States.

Davidson loved the Society and put his heart's blood into it and it will always treasure his memory as that of its greatest President. His successors have been gladly content to carry on the work which he began.

When the idea of forming an association composed not only of architects but also of engineers, builders and material men was first proposed, Davidson at once grasped its value and importance and from the conception of that idea until his death he worked unceasingly to build up and strengthen the Architects' Club of Chicago.

He was willing to take the difficult job of Treasurer, which no one else would accept, and he held that job until he died in harness. Due to his carefulness and to his wisdom the Architects' Club has never been in financial difficulties and even in these past months of great financial depression, he has kept the head of the Club bravely above water. God rest his soul—he was faithful unto the end.

It has been my privilege, during the past five years of close association in the building up of the Architects' Club, to get an inside light on the character of the man who was always my faithful and loyal supporter in all that I tried to do. It was indeed a privilege.

Under a seemingly gruff exterior beat a heart of gold. Never did he refuse to listen to an appeal from younger men who were battling with the problems of this mechanical age and when he found the appeal sincere he was ever ready to help. Only insincerity aroused his wrath and then he was really at his best but his explosions, like August thunderstorms, were always followed by sweet sunshine.

The Club and the Society have lost a wise councillor and a most valued friend. To those who knew him best and worked most closely with him the loss seems irreparable but let us remember his courage and his tenacity of purpose. We can please him best by determining to carry on. Again I say: God rest his soul.

ALFRED GRANGER.

Vienna, 17 April, 1931.

A COMPARISON

Suppose you suddenly decided to bring home a half dozen guests for dinner without notifying your wife, she in the meantime had prepared for the regular good dinner for the family and there, you were with six hungry friends. You cannot imagine the embarrassment of your wife, when after telephoning to all the trades people she found them closed for the day and no place to buy an additional amount of food. Every portion that rightfully belonged to the family was divided and in the final analysis no one was satisfied and all were hungry when the meal was over.

At the last meeting of the Illinois Society of Architects at least fifteen extra guests walked in on the chef without making reservations and the result was that there was not enough food to care for all present. After scurrying the neighborhood some food was finally secured.

While we are desirous of having a large attendance at our meetings we want it understood that we are not running a restaurant and only purchase enough food to take care of our members who make reservations.

The postal card that accompanies your notice must be mailed to arrive at least by the morning of the meeting. We like to be accommodating but we cannot do the impossible.

Remember—from now on no one will be served unless he makes proper reservation.

H. L. PALMER, Fin. Secy.

SURETY BONDS AND LIABILITY INSURANCE

Some of our members have been put to considerable expense and delay through lack of prompt cooperation on the part of Surety and Casualty Companies.

The existing depression has been a trying time for contractors and their surety companies, but this seems no excuse for the apparent lack of interest on the part of certain prominent companies.

Your Board of Directors form the Legal Action Committee of the Society and members are advised to bring their problems to the attention of the Board where they can secure advice based on years of experience.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS
The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue
Washington, D. C.

May 13th, 1931.

Mr. H. L. Palmer, Financial Secretary,
 Illinois Society of Architects,
 160 North La Salle Street,
 Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Palmer:—

On behalf of the Architectural Profession and the Construction Industry, I wish to thank you for the prompt endorsement of our policy regarding the Federal Building Program.

A committee composed of Baldwin and La Beaume of the Institute, Mr. L. W. Wallace, Executive Secretary of the American Engineering Council, Mr. A. P. Greensfelder, President of the Associated General Contractors of America, and Mr. H. H. Sherman, President of the Producers Council, met in Washington on May 6th and collaborated in the preparation of a careful memorandum, representing the attitude of the entire building industry, for the information of the President of the United States. This memorandum was approved and signed by all of the above named parties.

On Thursday morning, May 7th, this Committee met the President at the White House, by appointment, and discussed the whole question of the Federal Building Program with him. The points we sought to make were those covered in that paragraph of the Board's report, relating to Public Works, at the Sixty-fourth Convention of the American Institute of Architects recently held in San Antonio.

President Hoover assured us that he sympathized with every effort to expedite the Government's Program, and that the services of private Architects had been utilized to a considerable extent. He advised us to discuss details with Major Ferry K. Heath, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. Major Heath was obliged to leave Washington at one o'clock on that day, but arranged an appointment for the Committee with Judge Wetmore, Acting Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and one of his assistants, Mr. Martin.

Schedules relating to the present status of the Program were furnished us, and Judge Wetmore and Mr. Martin stated that sixty-three appointments of private Architects had been made to date. In some instances consulting Architects of eminence were coupled with these appointees, bring-

ing the total number of private Architects now engaged in Government work to approximately one hundred. They also stated that it was the intention of the Department to request the services of at least fifty additional private Architects located in different parts of the country. They asserted that they had the Building Program well in hand, and that they had no intention of further increasing the personnel of the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

Their attitude throughout the conference was entirely sympathetic, and Judge Wetmore stated that the Department welcomed, and would continue to welcome the assistance of outside Architects. They also volunteered the statement that their relations with Architects already appointed had been eminently satisfactory.

As you are deeply interested, I am, therefore, reporting progress to date. The assurances which were given us may be accepted as satisfactory, and we are hopeful that they will bear fruit. The Institute's Committee on Public Works is resolved to keep in close touch with the situation, and will notify you as developments arise.

Yours very truly,

LOUIS LA BEAUME,

Chairman Committee on Public Works, A. I. A.

LAB:LD

THE DOOR TO ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE

**An Address by Emory Stanford Hall, F. A. I. A., Before the
 National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
 at San Antonio, Texas, on April 13, 1931**

The door to architectural practice is the legal right to use the title "architect." The various state registration boards or committees are the custodians of the keys. At present, the keys are many and various, and the custodians are not equally careful. Safety demands that something be done to minimize the hazard. Custodians of the same thing must cooperate. One's neglect casts reflection on all. Too many people and too many different keys control the door to architecture. As citizens and architects what are we going to do about it? A simple way would be to discharge all of the help, put a new cylinder in the lock, grind one new key to fit it, and put one safe, sane man in charge. But it is not so simple as it seems. The doctrine of state rights prevails. That doctrine makes national registration an impossibility. No matter how much waste and inconvenience, each state must maintain the sovereign right to regulate its domestic affairs. Architecture being a domestic animal, it must always submit to independent state regulation. If we would solve the problem, we must find some way, not contrary to the doctrine of state rights, by which we can secure practical unity of separate state action.

If examinations are made the only key to the lock that locks the door to architectural practice, and all states have duplicate keys, the problem of interstate exchange of registration credit is reduced to the simplest possible terms. All that is necessary to do is to make the examinations properly stringent, universally uniform, and the desired results are accomplished.

Architecture, probably more than any other profession, save engineering, is interstate, and always will be. It would be fine if we could have national registration, but for reasons already stated, this will never be possible. With separate state control, there are always going to be state legislatures which will pass state laws to do the same thing differently. The scheme of a standard registration law uniform in all states is an ideal dream. It can never be an accomplished fact. Casting about for a remedy to accomplish desired results, it is noted that state registration laws for the regulation of the practice of architecture seem almost universally to provide that architects shall be in charge, either directly or in an advisory capacity, of all regulations having to do with the practice of architecture. In this uniformity of state legislative action, there is open a possibility of seeming great importance. If these architectural administrators could be frequently brought together in common assembly, as we are here, they could be brought to common thinking and acting. With common thinking and acting on the part of state architectural registration boards lies the possibility of uniform practice in the administration of the widely different state registration laws. This common understanding is the primary aim and purpose of this Council. There is no reason why we cannot work together. We are all architects, and we have one common purpose—

the making of the name "architect" mean something every where it is used.

Make the legal right to use the name "architect" a guarantee of competency in the art of architecture and we have a key of ample serrations to make safety certain. Let the winning of state architectural examinations be a goal earnestly to be striven for. If the game is fair and the going difficult, there will always be plenty of people to enter the contest. It is the easy game that no one cares for. Tell the average red-blooded man that he cannot do something, and he will. In the games of life, as in sports, the man who wins has to undergo the hard, gruelling trials of preparation. A game is not a game worth entering that does not require strenuously intense preparation.

High school and college training are only a step in the preparation for professional practice. They are not **preparation**. Practical experience is only another step in preparation for professional practice. It is not **preparation**. Preparation for architectural practice is a combination of disciplines and experiences, which, when completed, makes one fit for the job of architecture. It is not one thing nor another. It is all of those things necessary. Necessity for one man may be superfluity for another. Every sewed-up bunch of intellect, sensibility, and will, which make up a man, has a varying reaction. We cannot be sure just what treatment to give it to get the results we are after. The test of education and experience is to develop correct reactions. Reactions developed must be so combined with the life to be developed as to produce, for the purposes intended, an effective human machine.

The preparation completed and the finished product offered for service, then we are ready for the test. A test is called for. What shall it be? Something that is easy or something that is hard? It is an insult to a real man to offer him a test which is not on a par with his ability. It is likewise a crime to offer the public, under the name of "architect," men without sufficient ability to properly and safely perform the functions of an architect.

The job of the state examining board or committee is not to reduce the number of architects available for practice. It is their job to see that every one available for practice is competent to perform his task with safety and satisfaction to the public, also, at the same time, with some credit to the profession which he represents. There is nothing to be complained of if the standards are high, provided they are appropriate standards of requirement important to the practice of architecture. Architecture must not be a closed corporation denied to any man who can meet appropriate standard entrance tests. Examinations conducted at any time during the stage of preparation for practice should be considered as progress examinations. At the end, when a man's work of preparation is complete, he should have a key that exactly fits the lock on the door to entrance to practice, and that key should be adequate preparation proved by a legally conducted fair examination. If this is important in other learned professions like law and medicine, it is of equal importance in architecture. It is up to the registration boards, acting as a unit, to make the name of architect of real meaning. It must have a significance that cannot be questioned. It is not so very important whether anybody has to hire an architect or not, but it is of tremendous importance to know, beyond a peradventure, that if they do hire an architect, they are going to get their money's worth.

Few people realize the tremendous hazards of building. Those who do, think they are entirely of so-called structural character. Yet, nothing could be farther from the truth. The economic hazard of mistaken diagnosis and bad planning costs this country a perfectly enormous sum. How much, it is impossible to estimate. By a study of typical cases among the nearly 6 billions of average annual building construction before the panic of 1929, the percentage indicates an immense economic loss. Once a man planned a theatre without any appropriate knowledge of the science of plan, and because of this ignorance, and not on account of any engineering or structural defect, 700 lives were wiped out. Another man planned a factory, and because of lack of visualizing power was unable to foresee appropriate routing of material and processes, causing numerous instances of cross-traffic, difficult work done under bad light, and other plan defects. Financial losses in such cases cannot be estimated on the basis of percentage of cost of building. Instances such as ruined eyesight, broken down health, daily financial leaks due to poorly organized layouts, lighting position, etc., are continuous daily losses

which may amount to many times the cost of the original building.

Final examinations should take cognizance of scope and character of preparation and grade same justly and fairly in accordance with a carefully worked out system of grading. Examinations for entrance to practice have, as their primary purpose, the determination of a broadness of training sufficient to prove that the candidate is able to discharge any one of the functions which might fall under the architect's duties. It should not be the purpose of entrance examinations to qualify specialists in some form of architectural practice. If any one wants to specialize in some one branch of architecture, he has the right to specialize as much as he pleases, after he has once established his qualifications for general architectural practice. Optometrists have not the right to call themselves M. D.'s or to treat defective eyes other than to fit glasses. But ophthalmologists, who were first M. D.'s qualified for general medical practice, and then afterwards specialists, may both fit glasses and administer medical treatment. It is unsafe to treat the eye without a knowledge of the whole human body. It may be a disease of the stomach that is really causing trouble with the eye. There are, no doubt, optometrists who would like the emoluments of treating the eye without walking the hard road of complete medical preparation.

We hear much argument these days concerning the alleged injustice of requiring men who are clever with the pen, the pencil, and the brush to know something about the science of building. We, also, hear similar argument concerning those who are well-versed in the mathematics and science of building who have nothing of the imaginative and picturing power, which is so essential to thinking out and clothing a building project before it is constructed. The specialist in design needs to know construction and administration before he is qualified to resign, and the specialist in construction needs to have aesthetic sense and dream power before he is qualified to properly detail construction, and both the designer and the constructor need to understand something of the principles of the mechanics involved in the supply of air, water, and electricity, and the apparatus which they supply, control, or operate. No man can be construed to be a competent designer who does not understand the principles involved in the mechanisms which his design houses. No design can be construed as ideal design that does not express the thing it clothes. No construction can be construed as well-designed unless it embodies something of symmetry and proportion. This is an insistent plea that the title "architect" be reserved for only those who can show general qualifications and reasonable understanding of all of the design, structural, mechanical, and aesthetic problems that enter into building.

Certain aspirants to the financial and social emoluments of architecture have given themselves to ridiculing the idea of any single person being able to acquire all of the essential general knowledge requirements for competent architectural practice. That talk finds its source in the laziness of some people who do not want to spend the time and labor necessary to properly prepare for the professional practice of architecture. This idea finds advocates among two widely divergent classes—rich men's sons who want to use the title "architect," and only be required to spend a little time in the study of depiction and no time at all in the drudgery incident to the long, systematic courses of technical training, followed by a more or less menial period spent in gaining practical experience in the various departments of an architect's office, or, in the other extreme, poor men's sons who are sure, because of their financial handicaps, that it is impossible for them to find the necessary time and expense to undertake college training, and men who want to earn wages all of the time they are engaged in preparation. The idea that a single individual can acquire theoretical knowledge and practical experience in all the departments of architecture is not a conceited notion; it is absolute necessity. Broad architectural training is not so hard nor so impossible as some would have you think. It does not matter much if some of these men never get into architecture. We are not very much concerned in getting poor men jobs nor rich men social position. There is plenty of work in business for those who do not wish to prepare for the professions. The thing that a professional man has to sell is knowledge and experience. If he has not systematic knowledge and experience, or if he has only one without the other, and he attempts to practice the profession, he is asking remuneration for some-

thing, he is not giving. In the training of an architect, we are not asking that he be an expert electrician, an expert concrete worker, an expert plumber, draftsman, chemist, or physicist, and that he know all that there is to know about the history of civilization and social science, but we are asking that he know the fundamental principles of the mechanics of materials, mechanism, and design, and that he be familiar to an understanding point with usual customary practice. We expect him to know enough of the history of civilization and social science to understand that good architecture has always in all ages been the outgrowth of the social conditions and ideals of that age. He must be made to consciously understand that real architecture of any age, any age if you please, is the outgrowth of conscious or subconscious human need. We know, from a knowledge of what other men have done, that it is practical and possible with appropriate natural ability and careful application extended over a period of approximately 11 years from the time a boy leaves the elementary schools and is ready to enter high school for a man to acquire a good general architectural education. This is the minimum period required by medicine, theology, and approximately so in law, civil engineering, and chemistry. Shall architecture ask any less? Shall it admit any one who cannot reasonably make the grade in that period of time, or who is unwilling to spend that period of time in preparation?

The competent professional architect of broad training is a social need. He occupies a definite place as a creator, a general, and an umpire in the building industry. Eliminate the architect and you eliminate fair competition in the building business, which means its eventual monopoly by a few general contractors. If the building program is too big for the understanding of the architect after 11 years of special training, what must it be for the general contractor without any training?

The architect cannot hold his place of respect and prestige and be nothing but a specialized designer or a specialized engineer. Prestige is a fleeting thing; it cannot be held except by the superior knowledge and understanding which give poise, or by dollars which mean power. Which shall it be? I say knowledge. I, for one, am not ready to concede that the prestige of dollars should be superior to the prestige of knowledge.

The technique of examinations needs to be well-organized, commonly understood and agreed to between the various registration boards. To be specific, I suggest as follows:

(1) That we agree that it requires the normal man a minimum period of 8 years of high school and college work plus three years of practical training, or a total period of 11 years to prepare for architectural practice.

(2) That if preparation is to be made while engaged all of one's working day time in gainful employment that the period should be extended to not less than 15 years.

(3) That whatever the method of preparation that, during the entire extent of the preparational period, there be periodic examinations, or tests, to note comparative progress. High school and college diplomas would be proper certification for those pursuing systematic education, and employer's certificates might answer for practical experience, but for men acquiring training through night schools and private tutors, some better method than now exists should be devised.

(4) Having completed the theoretical training and practical experience prescribed and passed all of the stage examinations, the candidate is ready for his final entrance examinations. These examinations, because they are final and for entrance to practice, should be conducted by a competent jury of not less than 5 college trained men who, in addition to college training and required practical experience before practice, should have had not less than 10 years of actual practical experience in the independent practice of architecture as a principal with all of its attendant responsibilities.

(5) Examination questions in the final entrance examinations, whether on history, art, mechanics, or construction practice should be closely linked up with present day practice. It may be assumed that all abstract questions have been covered in previous so-called stage examinations. No problem of practice should be given that has not occurred and been actually worked out and constructed in the ordinary practice of the examiners. Even questions in history should have a social application that could have a bearing

on present day practice. Examinations should place the candidate in as nearly the same condition as he would be in actual practice as possible. He should not be expected to memorize formulae which, in the office, he would take from text books. He should be allowed the free use of these. He should be required to prove the thorough understanding of theory as intelligently applied to practice.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ARCHITECTS' PRACTICES

Paper Read Before the Monthly Meeting of the Illinois Society of Architects on April 28, 1931, by

F. Chas. Starr

Some three months ago, Mr. Elmer Jensen became convinced that an effort should be made to increase architects' net profits and with this thought in mind, he invited a few architects to meet him at luncheon and discuss the matter. On January 22nd, Messrs. Holabird, Chatten, White, Carr, Fugard and myself representing Mr. Schmidt, with Mr. Jensen, met at the Union League Club. Mr. Jensen explained what he had in mind and raised the question as to whether it would be worth while for a few men such as those present who were vitally interested to really study existing practices with a view to suggesting, if possible, ways and means of increasing the net profits of an architect without reducing the standard of service he should furnish an owner and still without violating any accepted canons of ethics or attempting the impossible. Everyone was of the opinion that the objective was worth a trial, so these same men, with a few changes, have been meeting weekly for the past three months discussing various matters involving architects' expenses and profits, solely with a view to determining if it be possible to offer any concrete suggestions that might meet with the ultimate approval of local practicing architects, and if happily they be practiced with some degree of unanimity, prove to be to their benefit. This committee therefore was an entirely informal affair, though it did have a serious purpose.

Soon after this so-called Jensen or Architects' Service Committee was formed, it was learned that a National Committee appointed by President Kohn of the A. I. A. had been formed to study possible revisions of Schedule of Charges. This consists of M. H. Furbringer of Memphis, chairman, with A. H. Albertson of Seattle, S. W. Jones of New York City, W. S. Parker of Boston, N. G. Walker of Ft. Meyer, Fla., and W. J. Smith of Chicago, members. This indicated that our little committee had struck a common chord at least. Then some one suggested that our committee should have some standing at court with the net result that the same personnel was appointed as members of a Joint Committee on Architects' Practices by the Illinois Society of Architects and the Chicago Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, adding Mr. Ferrenz from the I. S. A., so since March 25, 1931, we have met under the more formal title.

It is altogether evident, of course, that a study of profits can include a multitude of ramifications. The committee never hoped to exhaust them, but rather to confine its thought to a comparatively few matters which seemed to offer the best chance of accomplishing results worth while. At once the difficulties and objections to any change were evident and they grew in magnitude as matters were discussed. However, there has been no doubt at any time but that some good would come from the study if it were given enough serious consideration and particularly if all the local practicing architects would likewise cooperate in carefully studying any suggestions that might be offered, and wholeheartedly endeavor to follow whatever change in procedure or practice that might receive the approval of the majority. Without such concerted action, any changes would, of course, be of no avail.

The committee has already spent hours discussing certain definite matters but really can do little more at present than report progress. Some of the subjects on the slate include the following:

1. Should an architect be paid extra (beyond his fee) for:
 - (a) Services of Structural Engineers.
 - (b) Services of Mechanical Engineers.
 - (c) Blue prints beyond a certain number.
 - (d) Transportation of self and assistants.
 - (e) Long distance telephone.
 - (f) Telegrams.

- (g) Changes in plans once approved by owner.
 - (h) Handling work on sub-divided contracts.
 - (i) Supervision beyond occasional calls of architect.
 - (j) Water color sketches for promotional purposes.
- and a few other subjects such as:
- (a) Should an architect share in the savings on a Limit of Cost contract, with the owner and contractor?
 - (b) What can be done to lessen the cost to an architect for checking shop drawings?
 - (c) Should an architect receive additional compensation if work is performed on a Cost-Plus basis?
 - (d) Should effort be made to increase the basic fee of 6 per cent now recommended by the A. I. A.?
 - (e) Can any improvement be made in present practice of pro-rating such items as plaster patching and glass breakage?
- Etc., etc.

While a number of these matters have been discussed in the committee, no definite recommendations have been reached as yet. To the matter of Shop Drawings, however, more thought has been given than any other one subject, and of this I will indicate briefly the result of the committee's deliberations.

Basically, all seem to agree that architects are spending too much money in checking shop drawings. With the increasing complexity of modern building construction, shop drawings have been increased in number and detail to a great extent, but of more importance to the architect is the generally accepted fact that the average contractor does not assume his full responsibility therewith. The contractor is paid a fee to construct a building and one essential in that undertaking is to correlate the work of all his subcontractors. Fundamentally, the architect designs the building and shows on his contract drawings and specifications what he wants accomplished. He shows in sufficient detail by drawings and words the strength of an item and the duty it is to perform, but he does not attempt, except in special cases, to show the detail construction a mechanic should have to fabricate the item in its capacity. The contractor through his subcontractor is required to submit detailed dimensioned shop drawings showing how the item can be fabricated, and accomplish the major requirements as shown in architect's plans and specifications, and at the same time fit in with the work of adjacent trades.

Unfortunately the average contractor feels that he has performed his full duty in the matter when he sees that his subcontractor submits some kind of a shop drawing to the architect, expecting the architect to check over all dimensions and see that there is no interference with other trades. The contractor is paid to build per plans and specifications and one of his important functions is to coordinate the work of all his subs. He should check, himself, or through others in his employ, all his subcontractors' shop drawings to ascertain if all dimensions are correct and that the requirements of the plans and specifications have been faithfully met, **before** submitting them to the architect. All the architect should have to do is to see that the general design as indicated on the shop drawing is satisfactory; he should **not** be obliged to check over endless figures to see if they are correct or that the work will fit with other trades. The contractor is paid for this and should do all work necessary to accomplish it.

But the architect has gradually assumed at least tacitly the responsibility for such checking. It should be made clear that the contractor is responsible for making and checking the necessary shop drawings and thus relieve the architect of the expense involved. The contractor is paid for that work and the architect is not. It is therefore only fair and equitable that the contractor should do it.

It may appear at first that this would mean that the architect is shirking his responsibility. It is to be assumed that the architect has made his contract plans and specifications sufficiently clear so that all major requirements are covered, and herein lies the architect's responsibility. Checking shop drawings then becomes a part of the contractor's responsibility. To include the detail of a shop drawing, generally speaking, on the architect's contract drawing would restrict competition and be undesirable to the contractor and owner alike.

The committee therefore recommends that the following paragraphs be inserted in the General Conditions of all

contracts:

SHOP DRAWINGS

The contractor shall be responsible for the prompt submission of proper shop drawings. Such drawings shall be submitted wherever specified or where necessary to indicate completely the detailed construction and insure proper coordination with the work of other contractors.

The contractor shall carefully inspect all shop drawings before submitting them to the architect and shall certify them with a stamp signifying (1) that he has carefully checked them, (2) that they conform to the drawings and specifications, and (3) that they do not conflict with any other work or trade. Any evasion of this responsibility will not be tolerated. All shop drawings shall be checked by qualified individuals satisfactory to the architect. The contractor may do this work in the architect's office, if the work will be facilitated thereby.

After the shop drawings have been checked as indicated, the contractor shall deliver them to the architect who will examine same to see that the intent of the drawings and specifications has been met, but without making any detailed check of dimensions, etc. If satisfactory, the architect will then so identify them by a stamp and return them to the contractor. This identification will not relieve the contractor from his responsibility for the correctness of the drawings. No work shall be started until such identification has been obtained.

In case the contractor fails to check the shop drawings properly or to have this work done by qualified parties, in the opinion of the architect, then the architect will do this work and be reimbursed the cost of same by the contractor, the responsibility for correct dimensions to remain, however, with the contractor.

The contractor shall furnish the architect with three copies of all shop drawings and also send copies to other contractors as directed by the architect.

SCHEDULE OF SHOP DRAWINGS, SAMPLES AND MODELS

Within two weeks after award of contract, the contractor shall submit to the architect a carefully prepared schedule of shop drawings, samples and models, listing all that will be needed on the work, with dates when each will be submitted to the architect and when each will be needed on the job.

These paragraphs will probably be published in the Society Bulletin and the committee would appreciate your careful consideration of them and your constructive criticism.

The committee also appreciates the response given to the first questionnaire.

There were 96 replies to the first questionnaire out of 580 copies sent out. The answers indicated that approximately 40 per cent of the offices do all their engineering with their own forces, 26 per cent do all but the larger or more complicated jobs, and 34 per cent secure outside assistance for all their engineering work. Replies also indicated that it is very generally the custom for owners to pay either directly or through the contractor for such things as surveys, soil and material tests, and structural steel shop drawings.

F. CHAS. STARR, Secretary.

IN MEMORIAM

NATHANIEL BUSER

Nathaniel E. Buser of Mount Morris, for many years one of northern Illinois' best known architects, passed away at his home on East Hitt Street on Thursday, April 23.

Mr. Buser was born April 28, 1851, at South Mountain, near Keedysville, Maryland.

He was a member of the Illinois Society of Architects and was familiarly known by some of his friends as "the country architect." He took great pleasure in the Society's activities whenever he was able to attend. He was a member of Samuel H. Davis Lodge, A. F. & A. M., Royal Arch Masons of Oregon, Knight Templars of Dixon and the Shrine of Rockford.